Introduction

Archaeological, cultural, and historical resources occur throughout the county, in all types of land use designations. This Element recognizes the importance of these resources and provides policies and implementation strategies to ensure that the County and private landowners identify and protect these resources. This Element works in partnership with the Land Use Ordinances (Titles 22 and 23) and state and federal laws, where applicable, to honor, identify, and protect cultural resources.

Cultural resources include prehistoric resources, historic resources, Native American resources, and paleontological resources. Prehistoric resources correspond to the remains of human occupation prior to European settlement. Historic resources refer to remains after European settlement and may be part of a "built environment," including human-made structures used for habitation, work, recreation, education, and religious worships such as houses, factories, office buildings, schools, churches, museums, hospitals, bridges and other structural remains. Native American resources include ethnographic elements pertaining to Native American issues and values.

Native Americans like the Chumash practice religion and learn about their history at special places such as Whale Cave, near Avila Beach, and Diablo Canyon. These places have special cultural significance and include sacred sites where prayer and spiritual ceremonies have been performed over hundreds and thousands of years. To Native Americans, such places represent their link with the past and are essential to their identity and culture.

The archaeological, cultural, and historical resources of this county, especially those related to Native Americans, are an important part of the history and heritage of this county. The need to preserve and protect these resources is not new as stated in the county's 1974 Environment Plan:

> *Unfortunately, many significant archaeological and cultural sites have been destroyed. Urbanization and uncontrolled public access appear to be the principal sources of destruction. Acquisition of sites is desirable, but funds are difficult to obtain for that purpose. Therefore, the application of special standards for the review of development can be the most effective way to protect archaeological and cultural resources, as well as historic sites. Educating the general public as well as landowners can also help protect these resources by increasing awareness and appreciation of their importance. (San Luis Obispo County, 1974, Environment Plan, Historic Element)*

This appendix provides an overview of the County's history, cultural resources, and regulatory context to supplement the goals, policies, and implementation strategies included in Chapter 4 of this Element.

Setting

Regional Prehistory

Archaeological research on California's Central Coast has tended to focus on Monterey Bay and the Santa Barbara area. Research has been conducted in other areas of the Central Coast, but the interpretation of archaeological data from these areas generally relies on cultural chronologies and artifact typologies developed for either Monterey Bay or the Santa Barbara area. Cultural connections certainly existed across the Central Coast from Monterey Bay to Santa Barbara, but research suggests that the area from San Luis Obispo to the northern end of the Santa Barbara Channel possesses unique environmental, archaeological, and ethno historical characteristics to have experienced at least some degree of independent development (Bouey and Basgall 1991). Regardless, recent cultural investigations and previous comprehensive overviews (cf., Glassow 1996; Jones and Stokes 1996; Roper et al 1996; Jones and Waugh 1995; King 1990; Bouey and Basgall 1991; Breschini et al 1983; Tainter 1971, 1977) do provide a framework for archaeological sites in the planning area.

The earliest documented collection of artifacts from the region dates to 1793 and consists of Chumash artifacts (Pilling 1952). Archaeological excavations along the southern California began during the late 1800s. These excavations generally concentrated on the recovery of artifacts for museum collections, and negatively affected numerous sites in the area. For example, Paul Schumacher excavated and subsequently damaged numerous sites attempting to amass collections of artifacts for the Smithsonian Institute (Moratto 1984: 123). Schumacher (1875), however, also conducted what might be described as a "scientific" survey of coastal middens in the sand dunes south of Pismo Beach for the Smithsonian Institute. The initial work of Schumacher and his contemporaries was followed in the early 1900s by the work of Philip Mills Jones. Jones (1900) made surface collections of artifacts at CA-SLO-56, the current location of the San Luis Bay Inn, for the University of California Anthropology Museum. The site was subsequently excavated in 1929, and defined as a large site complex, possibly a "capital of a regional chief" (King 1970).

George C. Carter initiated systematic excavation in the region in 1941, and documented three strata at Point Sal. These strata suggested strong affinities to already developed chronologies for the Santa Barbara Chumash. Regional archaeological research continued from the 1950s through the early 1970s at several localities such as Point Sal and other coastal sites (Pilling 1951); Arroyo Grande (Wallace 1962; Tainter 1971; Warren 1971); Morro Bay (Hoover 1973); Cayucos (Riddell 1960; Reinman 1961); and Pico Creek and Little Pico Creeks (Leonard et al. 1968). This work highlighted survey and single site excavation, and tended to reinforce theories that linked local cultures with surrounding groups, particularly groups to the south along the Santa Barbara Channel.

The excavations of six sites in Diablo Canyon by Greenwood (1972), is arguably one of the pivotal projects conducted in the region. Greenwood's excavations initiated large-scale cultural resource management (CRM) studies in the region, and provided the first radiometrically dated chronological sequence for the area. Radiocarbon dates obtained from two sites in Diablo Canyon documented a long cultural sequence that spans more than 9,000 years of prehistory. Other regional CRM and academic investigations have also tended to concentrate on the coast rather than inland areas. This research includes excavations at: CA-SLO-463 in the Los Osos Valley (Hoover 1973); CA-SLO-214 (Hoover and Sawyer 1977); the Fowler Site (Tainter 1971); CA-SLO-978 near Morro Bay (Gibson 1981); CA-SLO-372 (Baker 1977); several sites in Cambria and Piedras Blancas (Gibson 1979; Rudolph 1983); CA-SLO-99 in Pismo Beach (Breschini et al 1988); CA-SLO-7 and -8 in Diablo Canyon (Breschini and Haversat 1988); CA-SLO-186 and -187 in San Simeon State Park (Hines 1986); and CA-SBA-539, -670, and -931 on Vandenberg Air Force Base (Glassow 1996). The emphasis on coastal archaeological research has limited investigations in the immediate inland zone. Somewhat of an exception to this pattern is the work by Hoover and Sawyer (1977) at CA-SLO-214, the Los Osos Junior High School site.

Jones (1993) subdivided the Central Coast into three districts, Monterey Bay, Big Sur, and San Luis Obispo, to highlight geographic and cultural differences and similarities along it. Most archaeological research in the San Luis Obispo district has been conducted along the coast. There is relatively scant archaeological information regarding the inland area of this part of the Central Coast. In addition, most discussions regarding chronology have been site-specific rather than regional in perspective. Extant regional chronologies either tend to borrow from sequences established for Monterey Bay area or, more commonly, for the Santa Barbara Channel. Consequently, recent efforts at "building" local chronologies (cf., Glassow 1996; Jones and Waugh 1995; Bouey and Basgall 1991; Moratto 1984; King 1981) are still reliant, to some extent, on imported sequences from both the north and south of the San Luis Obispo district.

Established chronologies for the area do suggest continuity across the San Luis Obispo district. For example, the work of Carter (1941), Greenwood (1972), and Bouey and Basgall (1991) highlight similar developments and chronological correlates from the north to south end of the San Luis Obispo district. The regional chronological sequence, especially during early periods, also corresponds with frameworks developed for southern California (cf., Wallace 1955; Warren 1968). Recent research (cf., Moratto 1984; Jones and Waugh 1995; Glassow 1996) is beginning to address and rectify this circumstance.

Chronological models for the San Luis Obispo district of California's Central Coast generally identify four cultural periods: the Paleocoastal Period 11,000-8,000 B.P., the Early Period 8,000-3,000 B.P., the Middle Period 3,000-1,000 B.P., and the Late Period A.D. 1000-1800. The Paleocoastal Period (11,000-8,000 B.P.) proposed by Moratto (1984) and supported by Glassow (1996) is primarily represented by two sites at Diablo Canyon (Greenwood 1972). This

poorly represented period correlates with Wallace's (1955) Early Man Horizon I and possibly Bedwell's (1970) Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition. Sites associated with this period tend to be located near estuaries and bay shores, and highlight a pattern of resources exploitation that includes both marine and terrestrial species.

The Early Period (8,000-3,000 B.P.) correlates with other cultural designations such as Oak Grove (Rogers 1929), Archaic (Olson 1930), Millingstone Horizon (Wallace 1955), and Encinita and Campbel Traditions (Warren 1968). Sites during this period are no longer situated near bays and estuaries, but are located on knoll tops and inland areas near permanent sources of fresh water. Typical artifacts include large flake tools, side-notched dart points, bone fishhooks and harpoon barbs, and manos and metates. The settlement shift during this period is typically explained by the migration of populations due to regional changes in environmental patterns (cf., Rogers 1929; Harrison and Harrison 1966; King 1981; Moratto 1984).

The Middle Period (3,000-1,000 B.P.), as proposed by King (1981), correlates with Rogers' (1929) Hunting People, Wallace's (1955) Intermediate Horizon, and Warren's (1968) Campbell and Chumash Traditions. There appears to be some continuity in site use from the Early Period through the Middle Period, but identifying sites that exhibit initial use and/or occupation is not unusual. This period is highlighted by an expansion of the subsistence base (i.e., an increased reliance on large pelagic fish and acorns). The settlement system includes both large villages and smaller logistic camps, and assemblages reveal an increase in shell beads and exotic trade items such as obsidian. This period seems to represent a time of cultural expansion, increased cultural complexity, and increased sociopolitical interaction (Hoover 1980).

The Late Period (A.D. 1000-1800), as proposed by King (1981), correlates with Rogers' (1929) Canaliño and Chumash cultures and Wallace's (1955) Late Prehistoric Horizon. The period is generally representative of ethnographic Chumash culture, and is characterized by an increase in population, the location of settlements to facilitate ocean access, introduction of the bow and arrow, and an increase in acorn use. There is also evidence of site specialization and a developed social hierarchy as suggested by burials and their associated grave goods (Hoover 1980; Bouey and Basgall 1991).

Full cultural development of the Chumash occurred during the Late Period. Marine fishing and trading constituted the principal economic pursuits. Differentiation in social status developed to a point at which village chiefs inherited their rank and probably controlled trade and redistribution. Only certain high-ranking lineages built and operated plank canoes. Trade and redistribution of goods from different environmental zones was facilitated by the use of shell bead "money," made almost exclusively on the Channel Islands where a specialized industry of producing microdrills (used to make shell beads) from local chert emerged (Arnold, 1987: 247). Coastal Chumash villages featured circular houses made of willow poles and thatch, with a

hearth located in the center of the floor. Each village also contained a sweathouse, sacred council area, dance floor, and cemetery (Rogers, 1929).

During the Late Period, terrestrial animals were hunted with the bow and arrow (in addition to snares and traps), indicated by smaller projectile points weighing less than 3.5 grams (Fenenga, 1953). Acorns continued as a valuable food source, processed with stone mortars and pestles. As a storable food, acorns played an important role in increasing sedentism and developing social complexity (Johnson and Earle, 1987). Fashioned by specialists, shell ornaments and beads were used to reinforce status differences as well as provide a standard of exchange.

Current archaeological research along the Central Coast is attempting to refine chronologies and clarify relationships between groups across the area. The relationship of inland areas to coastal areas is also being investigated to identify settlement and subsistence strategies. This research will certainly expand and improve our understanding of regional prehistory.

Ethnography

San Luis Obispo County is within the territory historically occupied by the Obispeño Chumash (Gibson, 1990; Greenwood, 1978; Kroeber, 1953), with some overlap in the northern part of the County by the Salinan people. The Obispeño were the northernmost of the Chumashan speakers, occupying most of the western half of the county. The Obispeño dialect was quite divergent from the other Chumash languages (San Luis Obispo 2003).

When the mission period began in 1769, the Chumash occupied coastal areas from Malibu Canyon to Morro Bay and inland areas as far as the western edge of the southern San Joaquin Valley (Grant, l978a). The overall Chumash ethnolinguistic group included several dialectical subdivisions corresponding to territories around missions established by the Spanish, who assigned names to these groups. These subdivisions included the Ventureño near Mission San Buenaventura, the Barbareño near Mission Santa Barbara, the Ynezeño near Mission Santa Ynez, the Purismeño near Mission La Purísima, and the Obispeño near Mission San Luis Obispo. These missions were founded between 1772 and 1804. The Cuyama, Emigdiano, and Castaic Chumash lived further inland where no missions were built. Similarly, the Island Chumash inhabited the mission-less northern Channel Islands (San Luis Obispo 2007).

The Salinan are divided into 3 major divisions: the Antoniaño, Migueleño, and the Playanos. The southernmost Migueleño inhabited the northern portion of the county and derived its names from the Mission San Miguel Arcangel. The availability of archaeological and ethnohistoric data on the Migueleño is limited, especially when compared to the available data regarding the Chumash. The Salinan followed a hunting and gathering lifestyle based on the collection of plants foods; fishing and trade were also important components of their society (San Luis Obispo 2003).

Settlement, Social Organization, and Subsistence Patterns

Chumash occupy the California coast and Coast Range between Malibu and Estero Bay/San Simeon, including the Channel Islands (Kroeber 1925; Heizer 1966; Grant 1978 a,b,c). The aboriginal population has been estimated at between 15,000 and 20,000 (Cook and Heizer 1965; Brown 1967). Most descriptions of Chumash culture indicate a relatively dense population that exhibited an elaborate economic, social, and political life. The "complex" character of Chumash society is grounded in a flexible and mixed economic strategy highlighting both rich maritime and terrestrial resources (Hoover 1980).

Chumash primarily occupied villages comprised of round, domed structures made of willow poles and tule. Village locations are tied to seasonal strategies of resource exploitation (e.g., acorn, seed collecting, and fishing locales) (Landberg 1965).

Chumash society and their settlement system were organized around ranked lineages and distinct social stratification (King 1981). Chiefly lineages and other lineages associated with bureaucratic and ritual offices held the political and economic power of the social group. Villages were usually controlled by a hereditary chief who maintained power through the accumulation and expenditure of wealth, primarily in the form of Olivella shell bead money. In turn, high status "regional chiefs" controlled groups of villages. Other wealthy individuals, such as traders, were also capable of dominating certain aspects of the local and regional economy (King 1971, 1974). In addition, Chumash recognized other status positions associated with eclectic knowledge (e.g., weather predictors), specific rituals, and craft specialists (Bean 1974).

Technology

Chumash technology highlights the exploitation of marine resources. A typical Chumash toolkit includes Haliotis fishhooks, angled bone hooks, nets, traps, harpoons, and other projectiles (Hoover 1973). Northern Chumash groups used a distinctive Mytilus shell fishhook formed in a small J-shape and a circular form made of Haliotis shell. Chumash are routinely associated with ocean-going plank canoes, but their construction and use is limited to the Santa Barbara Channel (Greenwood 1978). The nature of the coastline within Purisimeño Chumash territory certainly limited the potential use of plank canoes and other types of watercraft in the area.

Steatite, bone, and shell beads were used for personal adornment. In addition, the giant Pismo clam (Tivela stultorum) was ground into beads and disks for use as money (Greenwood 1978). These shell disks were strung and traded by length, with the standard length being the circumference of the palm and outstretched fingers. Drilled tubes of clamshell were also very valuable, used as money, and also occasionally worn in the nasal septum (Greenwood 1978). Other popular non-utilitarian items of Chumash culture include wooden and bone flutes, steatite pipes, charmstones, and incised stone tablets.

Polychrome rock paintings of figures and abstract forms are well known traits of Chumash, particularly in the Santa Barbara Channel region.

History

Euroamerican Contact

Pedro de Unamuno's visit to Morro Bay in 1587 is the earliest documented Euroamerican contact with groups of Chumash in the general project area (Greenwood 1978:520). Unamuno was followed by Sebastian Cermeño, who stopped at San Luis Obispo Bay in 1595 (Greenwood 1978:520). The first overland expedition to the area was led by Gaspar de Portolá in 1769 (Greenwood 1978:520). The founding of Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa in San Luis Obispo in 1772 and the Mission San Miguel Archangel in 1797 had a dramatic effect on Chumash culture.

The Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa and the Mission San Miguel Archangel dominated the social, political, and economic lives of the people in the area during the Spanish Period (ca. 1769-1821). The Native American population, however, was slow to adapt to the mission "system" and convert to Catholicism (Englehart 1933). Religious conversion of the local Chumash population increased as the strength of the mission grew. This factor in combination with the onset of European diseases virtually ended the traditional life of Chumash in the region by the beginning of the early 1800s (Englehart 1933).

The Mexican Period (ca. 1821-1848) in California is an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution, and its accompanying social and political views affected the mission system. In 1833, the missions were secularized and their lands divided among the Californios as Ranchos in the form of land grants. The ranchos facilitated the growth of a semi-aristocratic group that controlled large ranchos or land grants. The local Native American populations, who were essentially used as forced labor, worked on these large tracts of land. Consequently, the Purisimeño Chumash, as well as other groups across California, were forced into a marginalized existence as peons on the large land grant ranchos (Englehart 1933). Ranchos in the general project area include Guadalupe (San Luis Obispo), Punta de la Laguna, and Casmalia (Beck and Haase 1974).

The Chumash and Salinan way of life was forever altered with Spanish colonization. As the Spanish compelled many Chumash to live within the mission compounds, they were transformed from hunters and gatherers into agricultural laborers. They were also exposed to European diseases to which they had no resistance. As a result of sickness and poor treatment, large numbers of Chumash perished under the Spanish regime. By the end of the Mission Period in 1834, the Chumash and Salinan population had been decimated by disease and low birth rates. The native population at Mission San Luis Obispo, for example, plummeted from 919 individuals in 1803 to just 170 by 1838 (Greenwood, 1978: 521). Population loss as a result of disease and economic deprivation continued into the next century (San Luis Obispo 2007).

The end of the Mexican-American War and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, mark the beginning of the American Period (ca. 1848-Present) in California history. The onset of this period did not alter the economic condition of the Native American populations working on the ranchos. The rancho system generally remained intact until 1862-1864 when a drought forced many landowners to sell or subdivide their holdings. Ranges began to be fenced and the economy shifted from cattle ranching to dairy farming and agriculture based on new crops such as wheat.

With the coming of the American Period, San Luis Obispo County was established as one of the original counties into which the new state of California was divided in 1850, but the present boundaries were not finalized until the Historical Survey Commission recommended more detailed codification of County boundary laws in 1919 (Coy, 1973: 233-237). First noted as a Spanish-Mexican pueblo in 1845 (Angel, 1883: 129), the City of San Luis Obispo was formally laid out in 1850 (Bright, 1998: 134; Gudde, 1998: 340). A stage line between San Francisco and San Diego included regular stops in San Luis Obispo from the 1850s through the early 1880s (Newmark, 1984: 153, 496).

By the 1870's, San Luis Obispo County began to transform from a poor, remote, and sometimes violent outpost of rural California to a locale prized for its diverse and spectacular topography, breathtaking scenery, and rich farms and mines. The cinnabar mining rush began in the Cambria area and dairy farms predominated in Edna Valley and along the coast. The region began to transform and dairy and mining commerce generated the need for improved modes of transportation. By 1894, San Luis Obispo was accessible by rail, and California State Polytechnic College was established.

Regardless of a change of economic focus, the plight of Native American populations remained, at best, relatively unchanged (e.g., the U.S. Senate rejected treaties between the government and Native Americans in 1851 and 1852, and military reserves were established to maintain various groups) (Heizer 1974). The Santa Ynez Chumash Reservation was established in 1901 at Santa Ynez, just east of Santa Barbara. Regardless, conflicts concerning reservation lands and federal recognition of Native American groups continue to the present.

Throughout the 1900's San Luis Obispo County remained largely an agricultural county. The World Wars and the Korean War brought economic growth to San Luis Obispo County as local suppliers supported the war effort. The County's agricultural diversity shielded it from the worst of the Great Depression of the 1930s. There were difficult times, however, for many of those who came from other areas looking for work. The second half of the century was punctuated with infrastructure projects needed to support post-war population increases. The Army Corps of Engineers built the Santa Margarita Dam in 1942 to supply water for Camp San Luis Obispo; however, the water from the lake was never used for that purpose. Pacific Gas and Electric

completed construction of the Morro Bay Power Plant in 1955. The 1960s saw the completion of Whale Rock Dam (the first major dam designed and constructed by DWR) and the Lopez Dam.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Paleontological resources are fossilized remains of ancient environments, including fossilized bone, shell, and plant parts; impressions of plant, insect, or animal parts preserved in stone; and preserved tracks of insects and animals. Paleontological resources are valued for the information they yield about the history of the earth and its past ecological settings. In addition, fossils provide important chronological information used to interpret geological processes and regional history. They range from the well known and well publicized (such as dinosaur and mammoth bones) to the more obscure but scientifically important fossils (such as paleobotanical remains, trace fossils, and microfossils).

Paleontological resources are generally found in sedimentary rock units in which the boundaries of a sedimentary rock unit define the limits of paleontologic sensitivity in a given region. Most fossil material is found where bedrock is exposed on the surface, typically in mountainous terrain or in areas where erosion has removed the soil or regolith surface. As a result, paleontological sites are normally discovered in cliffs, ledges, steep gullies, or along wave-cut terraces where vertical rock sections are exposed. Fossil material may be exposed by a trench, ditch, or channel caused by construction (San Luis Obispo County 2007).

Regional geologic papers usually present numerous invertebrate fossil sites especially in marine rocks. Some invertebrate fossil sites are more productive than others. The richness of invertebrate fossils in marine rocks makes a particular invertebrate fossil discovery of less critical concern and significance (San Luis Obispo County 2007). In the county, the Coastal Franciscan domain generally lies along the mountains and hills associated with the Santa Lucia Range (San Luis Obispo 2003). Fossils recorded from the Coastal Franciscan formation include trace fossils (preserved tracks or other signs of the behaviors of animals), mollusks, and marine reptiles.

Nonmarine or continental deposits are more likely to contain vertebrate fossil sites. Occasionally vertebrate marine fossils such as whale, porpoise, seal, or sea lion can be found in marine rock units such as the Miocene Monterey Formation and the Pliocene Sisquoc Formations known to occur throughout Central and Southern California. Vertebrate fossils of continental material are usually rare, sporadic, and localized (San Luis Obispo County 2007). Scattered vertebrate remains (mammoth, mastadon, horse, groundsloth, camel, and rodents) have been identified from the Pleistocene non-marine continental terrace deposits on Vandenberg Air Force Base to the south (Flarz, 2003). Presently, these sites are known through fossil catalogues (Jefferson 2001, Revised).

Regulatory Framework

Several federal, state, and local regulations and policies protect the county's cultural resources. These regulations and policies establish a regulatory framework for the County's cultural resources.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND POLICIES

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Register of Historic Places is the nation's official list of cultural resources that warrant preservation. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the National Register as part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect the country's historic and archaeological resources.

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1996, as amended, is the primary mandate governing projects under federal jurisdiction that may affect cultural resources. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that, before beginning any undertaking, a federal agency consider the undertaking's effect on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on these actions. The Section 106 process entails the following 6 steps:

- Initiate consultation and public involvement
- Identify and evaluate historic properties
- Assess effects of the project on historic properties
- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) regarding adverse effects on historic properties, resulting in a memorandum of agreement (MOA)
- Submit the MOA to the ACHP for approval
- Proceed in accordance with the MOA

The National Register of Historic Places lists 34 historically recognized locations within San Luis Obispo county; 18 of these sites are in the unincorporated county (refer to Table A3-3 below). National Register properties are distinguished by having been documented and evaluated according to uniform standards.

In addition to these sites, it is possible that other sites will qualify to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources in the future. Sites qualify for inclusion in these registers if they are determined to be associated with events or persons that are important in broad patterns of history; embody distinctive characteristics of

design and/or construction, represent the work of an important creative individual, or have artistic value; and/or possess the potential to yield import information in prehistory or history.

TABLE A4-1
SITES LISTED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Resource Name	Address	City	Date Listed
Caledonia Adobe	0.5 miles south of 10th Street	San Miguel	1971
Caliente Mountain Aircraft Lookout Tower	Northwest of New Cuyama	New Cuyama	1975
Carrizo Plain Rock Art District	Address Restricted	California Valley	2001
Corral de Piedra	South of San Luis Obispo on Price Canyon Road	San Luis Obispo	1978
Dana Adobe South	End of Oak Glen Avenue	Nipomo	1971
Eight Mile House	Off U.S. 101 on Stagecoach Road	Santa Margarita	1995
Guthrie House	Burton and Center Streets	Cambria	1980
Hearst San Simeon Estate	3 miles northeast of San Simeon	San Simeon	1972
Lincoln School	9000 Chimney Rock Road	Paso Robles	2001
Mission San Miguel	U.S. 101	San Miguel	1971
Old Santa Rosa Catholic Church and Cemetery	Main Street	Cambria	1982
Piedras Blancas Light Station	Highway 1 on Point Piedras Blancas	San Simeon	1991
Port San Luis Site	Address Restricted	San Luis Obispo	1978
Rancheria Del Buchon	Address Restricted	Edna	1978
Rancho Canada de los Osos y Pecho y Islay	Address Restricted	San Luis Obispo	1975
San Luis Obispo Light Station	Unknown	San Luis Obispo	1973
San Luis Obispo Light Station	Point San Luis	Avila Beach	1991
Southern Pacific Railroad Depot	1300 Mission Street	San Miguel	1978

Source: National Register of Historic Places, 2007.

National Environmental Policy Act

The use of federally owned land controlled by federal agencies or any project involving the use of federal funds triggers review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA addresses potential adverse effects on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and requires mitigation for loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

STATE REGULATIONS AND POLICIES

The Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan provides guidance to the Office of Historic Preservation and the preservation community for the identification, registration, protection, and preservation of important historic resources. It encourages both the consideration of historic preservation during planning activities at the local level and public and professional support for historic preservation. The State Historic Building Code provides regulations for the preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, relocation, or reconstruction of buildings or structures designated as qualified historic buildings or properties. Its intent is to facilitate a cost effective approach for the preservation and continued use of qualified historic buildings or properties while providing reasonable safety for building occupants and access for persons with disabilities.

The California Coastal Act provides guidance and regulations for the identification, registration, protection, and preservation of important historic resources.

California Register of Historic Resources

Per Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(a), the California Register of Historic Resources (California Register) is “an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” The Office of Historic Preservation in the California State Parks oversees and administers the California Register. The criteria for listing resources on the California Register are based on those developed by the National Park Service for listing on the National Register of Historic Places with modifications in order to include a broader range of resources, which reflect the history of California. The California Register includes resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest. Historical Landmarks are sites, buildings, features, or events that are of statewide significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value. A resource is considered historically significant if it:

- Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and,

Meets any of the following criteria:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The Office of Historic Preservation lists 13 historically recognized places within San Luis Obispo County, and 7 of those landmarks are in the unincorporated county (refer to Table A3-2 below). Historical places are distinguished by having been documented and evaluated according to uniform standards.

TABLE A4-2
CALIFORNIA STATE LANDMARKS

Resource Name	Address	City
Estrella Adobe Church, No. 542	Airport Road, 2.5 miles north of Hwy 46	Paso Robles
Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, No. 640	Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument	San Simeon
Rancho Nipomo (Cpt. William G. Dana Rancho), No. 1033	6715 Oakglen Avenue	Nipomo
Rios-Caledonia Adobe, No. 936	700 Mission Street	San Miguel
Santa Margarita Asistencia Rancho, No. 364	Santa Margarita Hay Barn	Santa Margarita
The Sebastian Store, No. 726	San Simeon Road	San Simeon
Twentieth Century Folk Art Environments, No. 939	Nitt Witt Ridge, 881 Hillcrest Drive	Cambria

Source: State Office of Historic Preservation, 2007.

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both "historical resources" and "unique archaeological resources." Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084.1, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on "unique archaeological resources." As a lead agency, the County is committed identifying and protecting significant resources.

"Historical resource" is a term with a defined statutory meaning (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5 [a], [b]). The term embraces any resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the California Register and are presumed to be "historical resources" for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (Pub. Resources Code, Section 5024.1 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 4850). Unless a resource listed in a survey has been demolished, lost substantial integrity, or there is a preponderance of evidence indicating that it is otherwise not eligible for listing, a lead agency should consider the resource potentially eligible for the California Register.

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines states that a project would result in a potentially significant impact if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

For historic structures, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(3), indicates that a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995) shall mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant.

Potential eligibility also rests upon the integrity of the resource. Integrity is defined as the retention of the resource's physical identity that existed during its period of significance. Integrity is determined through considering the setting, design, workmanship, materials, location, feeling and association of the resource.

Archaeological Resources

As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects will impact "unique archaeological resources." Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that "'unique archaeological resource' means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- "Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person."

Archaeological resources may also qualify as "historical resources" and Public Resources Code 5024 requires consultation with the Office of Historic Preservation when a project may impact historical resources located on State-owned land.

The Central Coastal Information Center (CCIC), Institute of Archaeology, University of California at Santa Barbara, operated under the State Office of Historic Preservation, is the official repository for all San Luis Obispo county data concerning surveys, site records, excavations reports, and relevant literature. CCIC provides site location data and/or the exact contents of surveyed sites only to qualified professional archaeologists, who are prohibited from disclosing this information to the public. California Government Code Section 6254.10 exempts archaeological site information from the California Public Records Act, which requires that public records be open to public inspection.

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of prehistoric plant and animal organisms. Paleontological resources are also the mineralized impressions (trace fossils) left as indirect evidence of the form and activity of such organisms. Paleontological resources are considered to be nonrenewable resources under state and federal law.

Section 5097.5 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) prohibits excavation or removal of any "vertebrate paleontological site or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with

the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands." PRC 30244 requires that adverse impacts to paleontological resources from development on public land be reasonably mitigated.

Additionally, Penal Code Section 623 spells out regulations for the protection of caves, including their natural, cultural, and paleontological contents. It specifies that no "material" will be removed from any natural geologically formed cavity or cave, including all or any part of any paleontological item.

Paleontologic sensitivity

Paleontologic sensitivity is the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils, as determined by rock type, past history of the rock unit in producing fossil materials, and fossil sites that are recorded in the unit. A paleontologic sensitivity rating is derived from fossil data from the entire geologic unit, not just from a specific survey area. However, it does not measure the significance of individual fossils present within the county, because it is impossible to predict what individual fossils may be discovered. The significance of an individual fossil can only be determined after it is found and evaluated (San Luis Obispo County 2007).

The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology recommends a three-fold classification of sensitivity, labeled as high, low and indeterminate, as follows:

- High Sensitivity – Indicates fossils are currently observed on-site, localities are recorded within the study area and/or the unit has a history of producing numerous significant fossil remains.
- Low Sensitivity – Indicates significant fossils are not likely to be found because of random fossil distribution pattern, extreme youth of the rock unit and/or the method of rock formation, such as alteration by heat and pressure.
- Indeterminate Sensitivity – Unknown or undetermined status indicates that the rock unit either has not been sufficiently studied or lacks good exposures to warrant a definitive rating. This rating is treated initially as having a high sensitivity or potential.

After study or monitoring, the unit may fall into one of the other categories.

Other professionals expand the previous classification to include up to three additional ratings of very high, moderate and no sensitivity, as follows:

- No Sensitivity – Some paleontologists use this for crystalline rock units such as igneous rocks, where the rock forms from molten magma, which would preclude fossil preservation.

- Moderate Sensitivity – Applied by some to geologic units that have a history of producing meager fossil collections.
- Very High Sensitivity – May be warranted for a project that contains very well known and scientifically important localities. Another example would be if a known fossil bone bed is present or is predicted to be present.

Regulations Concerning Native American Heritage

California Public Resources Code 5097.*9* states that no public agency, or a private party on a public property, shall "interfere with the free expression or exercise of Native American Religion…." The code further states that:

> *No such agency or party [shall] cause severe or irreparable damage to any Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine…except on a clear and convincing showing that the public interest and necessity so require. County and city lands are exempt from this provision, expect for parklands larger than 100 acres.*

Senate Bill 18 (Gov. Code, Sections 65352.3, 65352.4) requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or specific plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a city or county must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction. The intent of SB18 is to provide California Native American tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early stage of planning, for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to cultural places. These consultation and notice requirements apply to the adoption and amendment of both general plans and specific plans.

Regulations Concerning Human Remains

Disturbance of human remains without the authority of law is felony (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7052). If the remains are Native American in origin, they are within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (California Health and Safety Code, 7052.5c; Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98)

According to state law (California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98), if human remains are discovered or recognized in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

- The coroner of the county has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and
- If the remains are of Native American origin.

- The descendents from the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treating or disposing of with appropriate dignity the human remains and any associate grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98; or
- The NAHC was unable to identify a descendent or the descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.

According to the California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC.

Relevant Agencies and Organizations

The County includes cultural societies, museums and municipal agencies that work to promote the preservation of cultural resources in the County. These organizations include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Atascadero Historical Society, Atascadero
- Camp Roberts History Museum, San Miguel
- Dana Adobe Nipomo Amigos
- El Paso de Robles Area Pioneer Museum, Paso Robles
- El Paso de Robles Historical Society and Carnegie Historic Library, Paso Robles
- Estrella Warbird Museum, Paso Robles
- Friends of the Adobes, San Miguel
- Friends of Hearst Castle, San Simeon
- Hearst San Simeon State Historic Monument, San Simeon
- Heritage Shared
- Hollister Adobe Museum, San Luis Obispo
- Jack House, San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Department, San Luis Obispo
- Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa, San Luis Obispo
- Mission San Miguel, San Miguel
- Morro Bay State Park Museum of Natural History, Morro Bay

- San Luis Obispo Archaeological Society, San Luis Obispo
- San Luis Obispo Children's Museum, San Luis Obispo
- San Luis Obispo County Historical Museum, San Luis Obispo
- Santa Margarita Historical Society
- South County Historical Society
- Shakespeare Press Museum, San Luis Obispo
- Templeton Historical Museum, Templeton
- Northern Chumash Tribal Council

References

Angel, Myron. 1983. History of San Luis Obispo County. Oakland: Thompson and West.

Archaeological Consulting, Salinas, California. 1988. Archaeological Investigations at CA-SLO-99, Pismo Beach, San Luis Obispo County, California. *Archives of California Prehistory,* No. 26. Coyote Press, Salinas, California.

Baker, B. 1977. Madonna Ranch CA-SLO-372: *An Interpretation of an Inland Chumash Site*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, California State University, San Luis Obispo.

Baldwin, Mary A. 1971. Archaeological Evidence of Cultural Continuity from Chumash to Salinan Indians of California. *Occasional Papers of the San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society,* No.6.

Bean, Lowell J. 1974. Social Organization in Native California. In *ANTAP: California Indian Political and Economic Organization*, ed. L.J. Bean and T.F. King, 11-34. Ramona, CA: Balenna Press Anthropological Papers No. 2.

Beck, Warren and Ynez D. Haase. 1974. *Historical Atlas of California.* University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

Bedwell, S.F. 1970. *Prehistory and Environment of the Pluvial Fort Rock Lake Area of South-Central Oregon*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Bouey, Paul D. and Mark E. Basgall. 1991. Archaeological Patterns Along the South Central Coast, Point Piedras Blancas, San Luis Obispo County, California: Archaeological Test Evaluation of Sites CA-SLO-264, SLO-266, SLO-267, SLO-268, SLO-1226, and SLO-

1227. Report prepared for the California Department of Transportation. Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., Davis, California.

Breschini, Gary S. and Trudy Haversat. 1988. Archaeological Investigations at CA-SLO-7 and CA-SLO-8, Diablo Canyon, San Luis Obispo County, California. *Archives of California Prehistory,* No. 28. Coyote Press, Salinas, California.

Breschini, Gary S., Trudy Haversat, and R.P. Hampson. 1983. A Cultural Resources Overview of the Coast and Coast-Valley Study Areas. Report prepared for the Bureau of Land Management.

Brown, Alan K. 1967. The Aboriginal Population of the Santa Barbara Channel. *University of California Archaeological Survey Report* No. 69. Berkeley, California.

California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation. 2007. Accessed October 2007. http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/

California Historical Society. 2007. California Cultural Diversity. Accessed October 2007. http://www.californiahistoricalsociety.org/programs/ca_listings/040.html

Carter, George C. 1941. Archaeological Notes on a Midden at Point Sal. *American Antiquity* 6:214-226.

Cook, S.F. and R.F. Heizer. 1965. The Quantitative Approach to the Relation Between Populations and Settlement Size. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 64:1-97, Berkeley.

Englehart, Fr. Zephyrin, O.F.M. 1933. *Mission San Luis Obispo in the Valley of the Bears.* W.T. Genns, Santa Barbara, California.

Gibson, R. 1986. Cities service Oil and Gas Corporation and Celeron Pipeline Company of California. On file at the Central Coast Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara, California.

Gibson, Robert O. 1981. Cultural Resource Test Program at SLO-978, San Luis Obispo County, California. Report prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles, California.

Gibson, Robert O. 1983. Ethnogeography of the Salinan People: A Systems Approach. Unpublished Master's Thesis, California State University, Hayward.

Glassow, Michael A. 1996. *Purisemeño Chumash Prehistory, Maritime Adaptations Along the Southern California Coast.* Case Studies in Archaeology, edited by J. Quilter, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Orlando, Florida.

Grant, Campbell. 1978a. Chumash: Introduction. In *California,* edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 505-508. Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Grant, Campbell. 1978b. Eastern Coastal Chumash. In *California,* edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 509-513. Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Grant, Campbell. 1978c. Interior Chumash. In *California,* edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 530-534. Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Greenwood, Roberta S. 1972. 9,000 Years of Prehistory at Diablo Canyon, San Luis Obispo County, California. *San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society Occasional Paper* No.7.

Greenwood, Roberta S. 1978. Obispeño and Purisemeño Chumash. In *California,* edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 520-523. Handbook of North American Indians Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Harrison, William M. and Edith S. Harrison. 1966. An Archaeological Sequence for the Hunting People of Santa Barbara, California. *Archaeological Survey Annual Report* 8:1-89. University of California, Los Angeles.

Heizer, Robert F. 1966. *Languages, Territories, and Names of California Indian Tribes.* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Heizer, Robert F.1974. *The Destruction of the California Indians.* Peregrine Publishers, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Hines, Philip. 1986. The Prehistory of San Simeon Creek, 5,800 B.P. to Missionization. Report prepared for the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento.

Hoover, M.B., H.E. Rensch, E.G. Rensch, and W.N. Abeloe. 2002. Historic *Spots in California*. Fifth Edition revised by D. E. Kyle. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Hoover, Robert L. 1973. SLO-463: A Food Processing Site in the Los Osos Valley, San Luis Obispo County, California. Ms. on file, Robert E. Schenk Archives, Treganza Museum, San Francisco State University.

Hoover, Robert L. 1980. Archaeological Survey and Cultural Resource Evaluation of Three Parcels in Camp San Luis Obispo, California. Report prepared for the General Services Administration, San Francisco, California.

Hoover, Robert L. and W.B. Sawyer. 1977. Excavations at SLO-214: Los Osos Junior High School Site. *San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society Occasional Paper* No.11.

Jones & Stokes Associates. 1996. Cultural Resource Inventory and Limited Test Excavation Report for Camp Roberts Army National Guard Training Site, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, California. Report prepared for the National Guard Bureau, Arlington, Virginia.

Jones, Phillip M. 1900. Preliminary Report for 1900. *MS. 347*, *Archaeological Research Facility*, University of California, Berkeley.

Jones, Terry and Georgie Waugh. 1995. Central California Coastal Prehistory, A View from Little Pico Creek. *Perspectives in California Archaeology* Vol. 3. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Jones, Terry. 1993. Big Sur: A Keystone in Central California Culture History. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 29(1): 1-78.*

King, Chester D. 1971. Chumash Inter-Village Economic Exchange. *The Indian Historian* 4(1):30-34. Indian Historian Press, San Francisco, California.

King, Chester D.1974. The Explanation of Differences and Similarities Among Beads Used in Prehistoric and Early Historic California. In Atap: California Indian Political and Economic Organization, edited by L.J. Bean and T.F. King, pp. 75-92. *Balenna Press Anthropological Papers* 2.

King, Chester D.1981. The Evolution of Chumash Society: A Comparative Study of Artifacts Used in System Maintenance in the Santa Barbara Channel Region Before A.D. 1804. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

King, Chester D.1990. *Evolution of Chumash Society, A comparative Study of Artifacts Used for Social System Maintenance in the Santa Barbara Channel Region Before A.D. 1804.* Garland Publishing, New York.

King, Thomas F. 1970.Avila Beach: Descriptive Data Hypothesis from the Excavation of 1929. *Archives of California Archaeology,* No. 2, San Francisco.

Kroeber, Alfred L. 1925.*Handbook of California Indians.* Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78, Washington, D.C. Reprinted in 1976 by Dover Publications, Inc., New York, New York.

Landberg, L.C.W. 1965. Chumash Indians of Southern California. *Southwest Museum Papers 19*, Los Angeles, California.

Leonard, N.N. III, D. Abrams, D.L. Weide, and M. Susia. 1968. Archaeological Salvage of Pico Creek and Little Pico Creek Sites, San Luis Obispo County, California. *Robert E. Schenk Archives of California Archaeology* 4. California State University, San Francisco.

Moratto, Michael J. 1984. *California Archaeology.* Academic Press, New York, New York.

National Park Service. 2007. *National Register of Historic Places*. Accessed October 2007. http://www.nps.gov/nr/

Northern Chumash Tribal Council. 2007. The Northern Chumash Tribal Council Through Time and Space. Accessed October 2007. http://northernchumash.org/

Office of Planning and Research. 2003. General Plan Guidelines. Accessed July 2007. http://www.opr.ca.gov/planning/publications/General_Plan_Guidelines_2003.pdf

Olson, Ronald L. 1930. Chumash Prehistory. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 1-21. Berkeley, California.

Pilling, Arnold. 1951. Surface Archaeology of the Pecho Coast. *Masterkey* Vol. 25(2): 169-172. Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, California.

Pilling, Arnold.1952. The British Museum Collection from Near Avila, California. *American Antiquity* 18:169-172.

Reinman, F.M. 1961. *Archaeological Investigations at Whale Rock Reservoir, Cayucos, California*. Ms. on file, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento.

Riddell, Francis A. 1960. Archaeological Reconnaissance of Whale Rock Dam and Reservoir, San Luis Obispo County, California. *California Department of Water Resources Archaeological Report A-2,* Sacramento.

Rogers, D.B. 1929. *Prehistoric Man of the Santa Barbara Coast.* Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, California.

Roper, Kristina, E.B. Bertrando, M.E. Clark, R.L. McKim, D.R. Harro, M.H. Imwalle, B.V. Bertrando, C.A. Dernardo, and B.A. Price. 1997. *Archaeological Testing and Evaluation Report: Segment 2 of the Chorro Valley Water Transmission Pipeline Projec*t. Report prepared for Montgomery Watson, Walnut Creek and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers by Applied Earthworks, Fresno, California.

Rudolph, T.P. 1983. Archaeological Testing at SLO-177, Cambria, California. Report on file at the Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara.

San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building. 1974. Environment Plan.

San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building. 1998. Agriculture and Open Space Element of the General Plan. San Luis Obispo, CA.

San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building. 2003. Estero Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report. San Luis Obispo, CA.

San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building. 2007. Affordable Housing Ordinances Final Environmental Impact Report. San Luis Obispo, CA.

San Luis Obispo County Historical Society. 2007. Accessed July 2007. http://www.slochs.org/

San Luis Obispo County Water Resources Division of Public Works. 2007. *San Luis Obispo Integrated Regional Water Management Plan: A Strategic Plan for Sustainable Water Resources to Meet Human and Environmental Needs in San Luis Obispo County, Amended July*.

Schumacher, Paul. 1875. Ancient Graves and Shellheaps of California. *Annual Report (1874),* pp. 335-350. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

Sheets, R. and J. Rudolph. 1991. *Cultural Resources Survey for Five Proposed Connections to the Mission Hills Extension of the Coastal Branch*. On file at the Central Coast Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara, California.

Tainter, Joseph A. 1971. Salvage Excavations at the Fowler Site: Some Aspects of the Social Organization of the Northern Chumash. *Occasional Papers of the San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society,* No. 3.

Tainter, Joseph A. 1977. Population Dynamics on the Santa Barbara Coast. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly,* Vol. 13, No. 3.

Wallace, W.J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for the Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwest Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Wallace, W.J. 1962. Archaeological Investigations at the Arroyo Grande Creek Watershed, San Luis Obispo County, California. *University of California Archaeological Survey Annual Report* (1962): 23-90, Los Angeles, California.

Warren, Claude N. 1968. Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States, edited by C. Irwin-Williams. *Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology* 1(3):1-14.

Warren, G.L. 1971. Skeletal Analysis of 4-SLO-406. *San Luis Obispo Archaeological Society Occasional Paper* No.4. San Luis Obispo, California.